

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

720 SW Washington Street, Suite 750
Portland, OR 97205
Ph: 503-228-6408 Fax: 503-228-6207
www.resolve.org

30 March 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: MLPA San Francisco Regional Working Group Members

FROM: Michaela Ledesma, RESOLVE and Sara Peterson, CA Department of Fish and Game

SUBJECT: December 12th San Francisco Regional Working Group (RWG) Meeting Summary and Action Items

Thank you for your participation and efforts at the MLPA San Francisco Regional Working Group (RWG) meeting held on Thursday, December 12, 2002. This memo includes a brief meeting summary and the following attachments:

Attachment A – Roster of Attendees

Attachment B – Upcoming Meeting Dates and Action Item List

Please carefully review the attached Action Item list (*Attachment B, Upcoming Meeting Dates and Action Item List*) to ensure we have included all of the agreed-upon tasks and to identify your work areas. Please feel free to contact me at (503) 228-6111 or at mledesma@resolve.org or Sara Peterson at (650) 631-6759 or at sapeterson@dfg.ca.gov if you have questions or concerns.

I. Welcome, Introductions, Proposed Meeting Objectives, and Agenda

Ms. Michaela Ledesma, RESOLVE facilitator, welcomed meeting attendees, (*see Attachment A, Roster of Attendees*) and reviewed the proposed meeting objectives, agenda, and logistics; the RWG agreed to proceed with the proposed agenda as planned.

A RWG member requested a funding update from the Department of Fish and Game. Ms. Sara Peterson, RWG Coordinator for the Department of Fish and Game (DFG), explained that there had been no specific DFG decision made regarding MLPA funding. More information will be made available in late January 2003.

II. Review of Action Items and Group Updates

Ms. Peterson reviewed the status of action items from the last meeting. Web postings have been completed and alternates have been added to the official Regional Working Group (RWG) list. Group members are each responsible for getting group information to their alternate if they cannot attend a meeting.

RWG members requested several documents at the September 30th, 2002 meeting. The PISCO brochure and Deborah McArdle's book on California Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) were distributed to the group by mail prior to the meeting. The MLPA RWG binder contains research and baseline data on existing MPAs; any additional local information on these areas is welcome. Ms. Peterson received some maps of coastal state parks, which are not in a useable format for group distribution. The PMFC closures and ocean current charts are available on disk and will be made available in hardcopy at a future meeting.

Warden Wharton informed the RWG that the Fish and Game Enforcement vessel 'Marlin' will be available, to Working Group members only, to visit existing MPA sites. It may also be used as a dive platform. Programming an underwater aspect to a RWG field trip may also be possible. Ms. Wing noted that helicopter photos of the California coastline are available at www.californiacoastline.com. This site may be helpful to RWG members in visualizing remote areas of the coastline.

Update on Fish and Game Commission decision on Channel Islands MPAs

Ms. Peterson provided a brief overview of the October 23rd decision by the Fish and Game Commission to adopt the Department's preferred alternative for MPAs in the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary. The proposed areas will take effect on January 1st 2003.

The group reviewed the specific regulations of the MPAs in the Channel Islands, as well as the process followed to adopt the Channel Island MPAs. Some of the MPAs may later be designated as State Parks; that designation is made in conjunction with the Parks and Recreation Commission. Warden Rich Wharton responded to a question regarding "stowed gear" by stating that there is no set definition according to the Fish and Game Code. RWG members inquired about the status of the lawsuit filed against the Department of Fish and Game over the Channel Island MPAs. Ms. Peterson acknowledged that she is aware of the lawsuit; however Department staff is unable to comment on the lawsuit at this time.

Meeting summary for Socio-Economic workshop

Ms. Peterson summarized the minutes of the Socio-Economic Workshop held on November 15th, 2002. Although workshop participants had tentatively scheduled the second workshop for mid-January, due to staff and budget constraints, the second workshop has been postponed. On behalf of the Department of Fish and Game, Ms. Peterson expressed appreciation for the range of expertise of the participants at the workshop, as well as their willingness to meet again so soon.

The working group looked at the prototype of a study introduced at the Socio-Economic meeting to determine areas where closure may be acceptable to the public. The research utilized simplified GIS programming combined with public interviews.

Group members expressed mixed reactions to the study; some members showed concern that the study was flawed and unrepresentative of the area, while others thought that the study could provide an accessible GIS tool that could be useful on a wide scale to gather data for MLPA decisions. One member suggested including the value of tourism in socio-economic studies. Some group members expressed concern that MPAs could negatively affect the economies of coastal communities. Ms. Peterson reiterated that this was a pilot study to show the capabilities of this tool and the potential for gathering data for the MLPA process.

III. Operating Principles – Discussion and Adoption

Ms. Ledesma reviewed the status of the draft operating principles discussed at the September 30th meeting. The group revisited the “Decision-Making” language in Section 5 and, after some additional discussion, agreed on the following language:

Consensus. When concurrence among members is possible, the Working Group will strive to make decisions by consensus. Consensus is defined as all Working Group members can agree to and support the recommendation or decision. If the group cannot reach consensus, members will evaluate the consequences of their disagreement and decide together how to address their lack of agreement including majority and minority reports. The Working Group will ensure that all opinions will be represented to the Department.

After amending Section 5, the group agreed to adopt the operating principles as final. Ms. Ledesma will incorporate the agreed-upon changes and RWG members unable to attend the meeting will have two weeks following electronic distribution of the final document to share any issues or concerns.

IV. MLPA Process Documents and Tools to Assist the Regional Working Groups

Ms. Ledesma and Ms. Peterson provided a brief summary of the overall MLPA Process. Group members discussed how the alternatives developed by each Regional Working Group will fit into a statewide Master Plan. Group members expressed concern about potential inequities across the state and about the lack of funding available to provide baseline scientific data for MLPA decisions. Others urged that the group continue its efforts with available data to create a strong recommendation that might encourage funding from the state. The group discussed the effects of funding on enforcement. Some group members believed that although enforcement is already limited, MLPAs may encourage community participation and self-regulation.

The group reviewed the Master Plan layout. The Department of Fish and Game will create a Master Plan based on RWG suggestions for MPA alternatives. Public proposals and suggestions for MPAs should be submitted directly to the RWG, not directly to the Master Plan committee. The Department has the ultimate responsibility of creating the Master Plan. The Regional

Working Groups may have the opportunity to review the Master Plan before it is presented to the Fish and Game Commission.

Tools to Assist the RWGs

Several tools are being developed to assist the RWG process. These tools include:

1. A timeline for the MLPA process. This should be available at the next meeting.
2. A template will be created to summarize existing or proposed MPAs. This template will be uniform between RWGs.
3. A recommendation flowchart detailing how Master Plan drafts will be developed and finalized will also be available at the next meeting.
4. GIS tools will be of use in developing the MLPA plan. Side scan sonar may also be available in the future.

Group members requested copies of the Initial Draft Concepts created by the Department of Fish and Game. Although the Initial Draft Concepts do not represent an existing proposal, group members could use them as suggestions in developing MPAs. Members agreed that RWGs would benefit from both joint meetings and sharing information. Incorporating information between RWGs is important and will become more important as the MLPA process continues. A group discussion revealed concerns about how government agencies will work together with regard to jurisdiction and funding when state parks and conservation areas are adjacent to each other.

V. Review and Discussion of Existing MPAs

Mr. Ryan Watanabe introduced the features of GIS programming. GIS maps and layers were used to display the boundaries and positioning of existing MPAs. The group reviewed each existing MPA within the region, summarizing existing regulations as well as group member expertise for each:

POINT ARENA/ ARENA ROCK

This MPA is adjacent to Manchester State Park. There are presently limited restrictions on fishing. Anchoring near cable areas is prohibited; however, the inside of Arena Rock provides safe havens for boaters to anchor. Since this MPA falls on the border between the Ft. Bragg RWG and the San Francisco RWG, Working Group members commented that it would be good for both groups to have input on this MPA. An individual thought it would be easiest to take lat/long coordinates of the rock, and draw a 300 meter circle around it for easier enforcement. Buoys could also help delineate the MPA area.

SAUNDERS REEF

This is considered an area of special biological significance. There are regulations on water quality and waste, but not on fishing. There are pending restrictions on gulch access by the Redwood Conservancy.

DEL MAR LANDING ECOLOGICAL RESERVE

Current restrictions prohibit all fishing except finfishing. The county park area provides access for recreational divers. The group does not have baseline data from before the MPA was established in the 70s. Residents of Sea Ranch may be helpful in enforcing restrictions. Sea urchin divers do not have much interest in this area since the present boundaries are difficult to discern and the risk of a ticket is too great. The group considered the benefits of establishing boundaries along latitude or longitude lines along with physical references, as well as an appropriate size for a proposed change to the existing MPA.

SALT POINT STATE PARK/ GERSTLE COVE RESERVE

Recreational fishing and most commercial fishing is closed in Gerselle Cove. Normal State Park restrictions apply in Salt Point. Gerselle Cove is closed to urchin diving. This closure has apparently helped produce urchins in the State Park. The area is known to have a large abalone population. Salmon fishing occurs in this area at ten fathoms. A picture of Salt Point at 35 foot depth was passed around the room.

FORT ROSS STATE HISTORIC PARK

The regulations here are similar to those in State Parks. A reserve was established here because of its underwater wrecks, which have been documented by Indiana University. The navy has also done work in this area. The State Parks Department has occasionally authorized urchin divers to clear this area. This MPA represents a popular recreational abalone diving location, and Ross reef is a very popular dive spot. The southern facing coves offer protection and access. A bell buoy within the seven fathom line is used for anchoring. Salmon and groundfish fishing occurs along the seven fathom line and at the mouth of the Russian River. This is also a finfish fishing area. Some group members expressed that it would not be favorable to restrict access to this area.

SONOMA COAST STATE BEACH

This MPA was created as an access point for fishing. Sonoma State University and the College of Marin have conducted studies in the area. It is an area of high recreational use. People salmon fish in this area. Group members believe that Sonoma Coast State Beach may offer the best coastal access on the Sonoma coast.

BODEGA MARINE LIFE REFUGE

All commercial and recreational take is prohibited in the Bodega Marine Life Refuge. Group members discussed the possibility of extending the refuge beyond or up to the jetty. The Bodega Marine Lab would likely benefit from extending this refuge to create in depth baseline data to be followed over time.

POINT REYES HEADLANDS RESERVE

This reserve was created for the protection of invertebrate species. The area overlaps the National Seashore. Many sharks, birds, and marine mammals live in or near this reserve. The area offers protection on a windy day and is therefore an important anchorage spot. National Park boats could patrol the area from Bodega head to Stinson Beach. Some group members suggested the possibility of extending this reserve.

DUXBURY RESERVE

The College of Marin has conducted a significant amount of research in this reserve. The Bolinas Rod and Gun Club has created several proposals for conservation areas, one of which was read aloud to the group.

FITZGERALD MARINE RESERVE

Fishing in Fitzgerald Reserve is selectively permitted. Group members discussed the area around Point San Pedro as a potential extension of the existing MPA because of its habitat diversity and because it allows good access for recreational fishers. Devil's Slide area was also proposed as a potential extension area. Although foot traffic is a problem in the reserve, the MLPA does not have jurisdiction over terrestrial activities. A study is taking place to examine the effects of fishing versus the effects of recreational use in the area. The regional working group could still make suggestions even though Fish and Game does not control the area above the high tide line.

SAN FRANCISCO

A number of small reserves will be designated as parks, and one area near Alameda will be considered a conservation area. Herring and Bay shrimp are the only commercial fisheries in the bay. The sand flats in the central bay are productive for flat fish. Sea grass bed areas vary seasonally. Group members thought that protected areas could be beneficial to protect spawning areas and to protect people from high pollution levels by limiting fishing in areas of high productivity. Another suggestion was to look for salmon corridors, sea grass beds and sand flats and protect those species regardless of pollution levels. The group will look into Fish and Game's definition of "marine" to get an idea of how far the group's area extends into the bay and its tributaries.

TOMALES BAY

Tomales Bay Ecological Reserve will be re-designated State Marine Park. The group briefly discussed the herring fishery in Tomales Bay.

VI. Next Step Tasks and Meeting Summary

Working Group members selected Thursday, March 20 or Thursday, March 27 as their upcoming meeting date. Upcoming meeting topics will include:

- Review and discussion of proposed new MPA areas;
- Summary and discussion of proposed changes to Del Mar Landing Ecological Reserve and Fitzgerald Marine Life Refuge; and,
- Marine reserve size, spacing, and total network size.

Master Plan scientists may be present at future meetings. Although a group internet posting may occur sometime in the future, for now, any group information or proposals should be sent to Ms. Peterson, who will distribute it to the rest of the group.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

ATTACHMENT A
MLPA SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL WORKING GROUP
December 12, 2002

ROSTER OF ATTENDEES

Regional Working Group Participants:

1. Dr. Ben Becker, National Park Service
2. Mr. Curtis Degler, Recreational Diving
3. Dr. Rod Fujita, Environmental Defense
4. Mr. Jeffrey Gunning, City of Point Arena
5. Mr. Mike Higgins, Non-consumptive Recreation/Diving
6. Mr. Tomas Mattusch, Coastside Fishing Club
7. Dr. Steve Morgan, Bodega Marine Laboratory
8. Mr. Jim Salter, Commercial Fishing
9. Mr. Tom Stone, Sonoma Coast Bamboo Reef
10. Mr. Roger Thomas, Golden Gate Fishermen's Association
11. Wdn. Rich Wharton, California Department of Fish and Game
12. Ms. Kate Wing, Natural Resources Defense Council
13. Ms. Katie Wood, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Proposed Alternates/Observers:

1. Mr. Rocky Daniels
2. Ms. Jenn Feinberg, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
3. Mr. Jim McCray, Sonoma County Regional Parks
4. Mr. David Yarger, MABB, Sebastopol, California

Department of Fish and Game Staff:

1. Ms. Sara Peterson
2. Mr. Ryan Watanabe

Facilitation:

1. Ms. Michaela Ledesma, RESOLVE, Inc.

ATTACHMENT B
MLPA SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL WORKING GROUP
December 12, 2002

UPCOMING MEETING DATES AND ACTION ITEMS LIST

Upcoming Meeting Date	Time	Location
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To be confirmed</i> – Thursday, March 20 or Thursday, March 27 	9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. (working draft)	<i>To be confirmed</i>

-Postponed-

Action Items	Who	When
1. <u>Operating Principles</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute revised draft operating principles with redline/strikeout changes for review. Finalize/post operating principles after two week comment period. 	RESOLVE to RWG RESOLVE and DFG	ASAP Following comment period
2. <u>Document Distribution</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circulate 3rd meeting notice including confirmed date, time and location Prepare and distribute December 12th draft meeting summary Distribute meeting materials, etc. by email Update RWG roster information as provided 	RESOLVE RESOLVE RESOLVE and DFG RESOLVE and DFG	ASAP ASAP As needed As needed
3. <u>Develop and distribute MLPA Process Tools</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule and timeline Template/criteria Recommendation flowchart 	RESOLVE and DFG	Prior to next meeting

Action Items	Who	When
<p>4. <u>Resource Materials</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute resource materials to RWG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sea Grant papers on larva and egg production from marine reserves; and, List of habitat classifications for MPAs in the region. 	DFG	ASAP
<p>5. <u>RWG Communication</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss how and when Regional Working Groups will share information with one another (e.g. joint meetings, etc.) 	MLPA Planning Team	ASAP
<p>6. Consider opportunities for RWG members to visit proposed and existing reserve sites</p>	DFG, Richard Wharton	Ongoing
<p>7. <u>RWG Alternates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep alternates informed of meeting dates, locations and topics for discussion 	RWG members	Ongoing, especially when unable to attend meeting
<p>8. <u>March Meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed agenda topics include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and discussion of proposed new MPA areas; Summary and discussion of proposed changes to Del Mar Landing Ecological Reserve and Fitzgerald Marine Life Refuge; and, Marine reserve size, spacing, and total network size. Identify and distribute background materials as appropriate 	RESOLVE and DFG prepare proposed agenda and circulate to RWG	At least two weeks in advance of March meeting